R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 656 AC 001 619

FOR A POLICY OF ADULT EDUCATION AT THE POST-SECONDARY LEVEL, BRIEF TO THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION OF QUEBEC.

BY- JOUBERT, MADELEINE
INSTITUT CANADIEN D'EDUCATION DES ADULTES

PUB DATE JUL 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.24 29P.

DESCRIPTORS- *POLICY FORMATION, *EDUCATIONAL POLICY, *EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, *ADULT EDUCATION, *HIGHER EDUCATION, PUBLIC POLICY, PROGRAM PROPOSALS, SPECIAL SERVICES, INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, ADMISSION CRITERIA, ACADEMIC STANDARDS, EDUCATIONAL METHODS, EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE, RESEARCH NEEDS, RESPONSIBILITY, GOVERNMENT ROLE, BUSINESS, SOCIAL AGENCIES, DEGREES (TITLES), COLLEGES, ADULT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, GENERAL EDUCATION, QUEBEC, CANADA,

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BRIEF SUBMITTED TO THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC IS TO HELP ESTABLISH AN ADULT EDUCATION POLICY FOR FUTURE COLLEGES OF GENERAL AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, WHICH WOULD INCLUDE PROVISION FOR ADULTS AT THE FIRST STAGE OF ORGANIZATION RATHER THAN ADDING IT LATER AS EXTENSION ACTIVITY. RECOMMENDATIONS ARE LAID DOWN CONCERNING THE NEEDS OF DROPOUTS AND OTHER POTENTIAL CLIENTELE GROUPS, THE VOCATIONAL AND CULTURAL OBJECTIVES OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, ADULT-CENTERED TEACHING METHODS AND STUDENT SERVICES, INFORMATION SERVICES AND GUIDANCE, ADMISSION STANDARDS, DIPLOMAS, STAFFING, RESEARCH, AND THE PART TO BE PLAYED BY THE GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS, AND SOCIAL AGENCIES IN SUPPORTING AND PROMOTING ADULT EDUCATION. POINTS OF PARTICULAR URGENCY ARE--SUITABLE MEANS OF INFORMATION AND COUNSELING, FAIR ADMISSION STANDARDS, APPLIED RESEARCH, AND PROVISION FOR STAFF RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING BY INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS. THE PROMPT CREATION OF ENABLING LEGISLATION TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION AS SUGGESTED IN THIS BRIEF IS URGED. (LY)

ED014652

RD

Office of the Dean

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

8 November, 1967

MEMORANDUM:

Attached is a narrative account of a Title I (Higher Education Act of 1965) project in which our school tried to learn something by conducting informal classes or discussion groups in economically underprivileged areas--chiefly in Harlem.

The director of the project and the author of the report was Dr. Harry L. Miller, associate professor of education at Hunter, an adjunct member of our faculty, and formerly associate director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

I am sending copies of this report to colleagues in New York University and in other colleges and universities in the hope that it will be not only interesting, but instructive. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to send them to Harry or to me.

This report is not copyrighted. You are free to make any use of it you like, though references to the source would be appreciated.

Russell F. W. Smith
Dean

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

AC001 609

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY'S HARLEM SEMINARS

During the academic year of 1966-1967, New York University's School of Continuing Education conducted a pilot project, A Pilot Program of Education in Human Development, Consumer Problems, and Public Issues for Recipients of Aid to Dependent Children Support in Harlem, on a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act, to test the feasibility of extending university informal adult education into economically underprivileged areas of the New York community.

The School became interested in the possibilities of reaching out to a totally different clientele than the one normally drawn to its classes either at Washington Square or in the suburbs when it learned of the existence of an informal group of welfare recipients in Harlem who had met for almost a year to discuss problems of urban life. That group was formed originally in connection with a New York Regional Plan program involving the organization of citizen discussion groups to view and talk about a series of television films on the region's problems. A social worker who heard of the program, convinced that the women who made up his case load needed an interest to get their minds off their own problems, organized a group among his clients to view and discuss the television programs.

With the aid of an urban expert whom he persuaded to lead the group, and occasional other visiting experts, the group continued to meet long after the television showings ended; members came and went, but there was a core group of four or five women who provided a consistent nucleus for the discussions. In the judgment of those who worked with them, the women involved not only learned a good deal, but succeeded in breaking through the shell of isolation from the community that surrounded the housing project in which they lived; they began to participate in community action programs and to take a general interest in the larger problems in which they were involved.

The School's proposal growing out of this experience advanced the hope of reaching larger numbers of such people, suggesting that:

1. Disadvantaged groups in such areas as Harlem are not indifferent to education, though they may be inept or unqualified to deal with existing educational structures;

2. The particular needs of this population must be taken into account in the design of courses, recruitment, and selection of instructors;

3. The goals of such a program should include not only an increase in knowledge and insight that participants might apply to their daily lives, but some gain in their resources for increasing their knowledge independently, and an improvement in skills of group discussion.

The pilot project based on that proposal began in September of 1966, with the first groups beginning in January, 1967. The original plan was to conduct six discussion groups for ten sessions, then begin on a second series of ten meetings with six new groups. Because we were interested in letting the situations themselves determine the form of the program to some extent, it turned out that new groups formed in four cases, one of the groups continued more or less intact through twenty sessions, and one group failed to jell the second time around. The table on the following page summarizes the general content and scope of the project; the remainder of the report supplies descriptive and interpretative material to flesh out that framework.

On their face, these data support the conclusion that the pilot project was successful; that it provides positive answers to some of the major questions which the proposal raised. The university, if it wishes to accept the responsibility and if it can find the financial resource, can indeed sustain an educational program for adults in underprivileged urban areas. We shall return to re-consider this conclusion at the end of this report, after examining in detail the educational experiences that lie behind the data.

HARLEM SEMINARS - ACTIVITY SUMMARY

Group	Number of Meetings	Instructor	Attendance Range	Attendance Average	Place of Meeting
Consumer Problems	10	Seitzman	5 - 8	6	Community Center
Consumer Problems	10	Seitzman	5 - 12	8	Community Center
Child Development	20	Adair	3 - 18	10	Church
Education and the School	10	Woock	3 - 20	8	Church
Education and the School	10	Woock	9 - 13	10	School
Consumer Problems	10	Toyer	5 - 10	7	Neighborhood Center
Consumer Problems	10	Toyer	0 - 7	4	Urban League Office, then Housing Development
Education and the School	10	Brown	5 - 12	8	School
Negro History	10	Ridley	0 - 11	6	Community Center, then School
Negro History	10	Ridley	5 - 11	6	Homes of participants

Selection of Faculty

Lacking any guidelines from previous experience, those responsible for the project felt, from the beginning, that flexibility of approach to major decisions in the pilot effort should be maintained. Faculty recruitment well illustrates that approach.

We began with two basic criteria in mind: instructors must have a thorough grasp of the field related to the seminar subject, and they must have insight into the problems of this particular clientele as well as an ability to relate directly to them as persons. The first of these is not only an obvious requirement of any program operating under the authority of a university, but necessary for any instructor who intends to respond flexibly to spontaneously expressed needs of the group. The second criterion is crucial; this population is not only likely to be suspicious of the ordinary processes of schooling, but likely also to reject the formal role relationships generally acceptable to middle class groups.

We early on wrestled with the question of whether the instructional staff should be all Negro. As it turned out, we would have had little difficulty in putting together an adequate staff consisting exclusively of non-whites, but decided against it on a number of grounds. Viewed practically, since the director of the project was white, a Negro faculty directed by a white person would provide justifiable grounds for offense. Further, on principle, to select teachers primarily on the basis of skin color instead of on relevant qualifications, is prejudicial, in the absence of any evidence that Negro adults simply will not learn from a white person. Informal consultation with persons who had community organization experience in the Harlem area supported the view that an integrated staff would be workable.

A list of possible instructors was compiled by asking for recommendations from a number of operating agencies whose programs brought them into intimate contact with either the Harlem community or other underprivileged areas in the city. Other recommendations came from administrative personnel of the School. Final selection resulted in a faculty of four Negroes (two men and two women), two whites (a man and a woman), four of them with doctorates and extensive teaching experience, one with an advanced social work degree and long experience in community work, and one a graduate student.

The subjective and chancy process of staff selection worked surprisingly well. All the instructors succeeded in developing a useful rapport, and demonstrated an ability to integrate the interests of the group with basic aims of their own.

The decision to use white faculty resulted in only two minor difficulties. In one case, the seminar group got involved in a project that brought it into contact with an established community group in Harlem, whose leaders displayed considerable suspicion and hostility to the instructor. The other incident arose as the first set of seminars came to an end, and we began planning the second set. One of the groups wanted to continue, and we offered them the option of forming a seminar on Education and the School; they liked the idea, they said, but not with a white person as instructor.

Recruiting

A number of approaches to the recruiting of participants were open to us, some of which, using mass media or impersonal mailings, were not even seriously considered. The project proposal had suggested the possibility that each instructor visit a variety of community organizations to obtain suggestions for course content as well as leads to potential participants. Starting with organizations and associations was obviously imperative, but we decided to use community persons to make the contacts rather than instructors, who would inevitably represent an alien world.

The project thus used most of its budget allocation for "promotion" to pay the salaries of six persons who were, in the OEO jargon, indigenous. New York University was in an excellent position to recruit these people, since it had played a central role in training family and teacher aides for the Head Start program in the area. Enlisting the cooperation of the city's office in charge of these aides, we interviewed a number of women who already had training and experience in recruiting Head Start parents and maintaining contact with them. Each of the six eventually chosen was assigned to work with one of the instructors, and designated as an "instructional assistant."

With the aid of a simply-written, one-page mimeographed description of each seminar, these aides canvassed the members of organizations we thought might be interested in the program, reminded participants of meeting dates during the course of the seminar, attended the sessions themselves, and were asked generally to be helpful in any way they could to the instructor.

It is difficult to reduce the recruiting effort to any set of patterns; there were almost as many different patterns as there were seminars. For convenience, the description below is organized by seminar subject.

Consumer Problems

Dr. Toyer's instructional assistant was active in an organization of welfare recipients whose aim was to put pressure on the Welfare Department to liberalize and make more flexible welfare benefits. She reported that other members of the group were interested in attending the seminar, and thought they might use a neighborhood community action center at which the association usually held its meetings.

The center was run by a local church, and it turned out that the priest who was responsible for it was not at all sure that social militancy and education made a sound mixture. Before letting us use the center he wanted to be sure that the seminar would not undermine the goals of the association of welfare recipients. His position seemed to be that his efforts to encourage these women to perceive that their problems could be attributed to a miserly and bureaucratic welfare system would be undone by an educational program that pointed out that the ability to make more enlightened choices would also help them.

Toward the end of the first series, a nearby branch of the Urban League offered to cooperate in setting up the second group, and provided a room in its own offices as a meeting place. The results of this collaboration proved to be disappointing. For the first two or three sessions attendance was very low or zero. Somewhat more successful efforts were made when the location was shifted to a nearby housing project, where the Urban League was operating another program. Although the sessions continued to completion, a solid nucleus, no matter how small, never did develop, despite considerable effort by both our instructional assistant and the League.

Mrs. Seitzman's first group was recruited readily in the neighborhood of a community center in which her assistant had some contacts. The group went very well, with excellent continuity. At the end of the seminar, we were invited to form another group at a center in a largely Puerto Rican neighborhood; the staff there was most helpful and provided excellent facilities for the group. These two were among the smoothest and most effective seminars in the program; Mrs. Seitzman handled with insouciance even the problem of keeping non-English-speaking women in the group.

Education and the School

These groups presented a special problem of recruiting because we planned to have them composed of parents whose children attended the same school. While this aim simplified the finding of target groups, it complicated matters by forcing us to get the cooperation of the schools themselves. The New York school system, engaged in intermittent guerilla warfare with its ghetto neighborhoods, was

understandably skittish about helping. Board of Education headquarters people, surprisingly, were more understanding and helpful than many of those in the field. We obtained permission early from the headquarters superintendent involved in community relations to make whatever arrangements we wished with any school, after which we compiled from various sources a list of principals who might be sympathetic to the idea of forming a parent discussion group.

In only one case did these arrangements proceed smoothly. In the others, we were forever getting them set, then finding the plans falling apart. In one case, Dr. Woock found that the principal of the school in which his group met had a very different view from ours of what the group's purpose was; he thought we ought to organize militant cells to foment revolution against the educational system. We decided to shift the meetings to a neighborhood church, and develop a group independently of the school's parent organization.

In another case, after canvassing a list of four or five principals, we came upon one who was very interested in cooperating, but who insisted that she needed the approval of the District Superintendent. That office informed us that it required the approval of headquarters. When we applied again to the same person there who had originally given carte blanche, he informed us that current decentralization orders gave the authority for such decisions to the district, which, when re-applied to, promptly turned us down. We finally found a school in another district in which a group of indigenous teacher aides wished to participate, and where the principal agreed to permit the use of school time for the meetings.

Negro History

Recruiting here was done in the neighborhood around a Harlem community center, and for several sessions a group failed to materialize at all at the time of meeting. Thursday evening was apparently a bad time; so in response to some expressed interest from several mothers of Head Start children at a nearby school, Mr. Ridley moved the meetings to the school and held them in the mornings, which worked very well. A group of mothers brought their children to school, and then held a discussion while they waited for them.

The nucleus of this group wished to continue after the first series was completed, but we also had some inquiries from others who could not attend during the morning. Mr. Ridley compromised by forming a new group, which met in the evening at people's homes, but carried over into it some members of the first group. The change made a remarkable difference in the atmosphere of the discussions, particularly in that it encouraged attendance by a number of men.

Child Development

Recruiting for this group went very smoothly, among the members of a church in which Mrs. Adair was herself well-known. Although clearly an advantage that was unlikely to be duplicated, this circumstance no doubt had much to do with the ease of recruiting, the consistent attendance, and the generally successful life of the group, which continued for twenty weeks.

It is obviously impossible to generalize from these experiences. The idea of meeting in homes worked well in one group, was disapproved of otherwise; evenings were better for some groups, mornings for others. Perhaps the most general statement possible is that one must use trial and error with any particular group in these neighborhoods, and remain willing to shift to whatever time and place seems to fit.

The use of instructional assistants from the community as recruiting agents proved very successful, and though we have no control experiences to prove it, it seems very doubtful that without them we would have been able to form and maintain the groups. They presented some problems, however, which in a larger scale and more structured program could probably be solved readily.

One difficulty lay in communicating to these assistants what the program was all about, and what they were to do. The whole idea of discussion groups for adults was an unfamiliar one, and we have no way of knowing how well they in turn communicated the aims of the program to those whom they tried to recruit. Fortunately, this ambiguity cleared up as they themselves attended the first sessions.

The more important problem was in getting them to perform other tasks which we perceived as crucial, but which they did not, as a result probably of our misjudgment on where responsibility for supervision should lie. The women were assigned to work with an instructor and to be responsible to him, but the instructors were, for the most part, very busy people. Some asked their assistants to write the reports on the sessions, for example, and without close supervision many of the reports were inadequate. Worse, in one case, the assistant never got around to writing them.

The most unfortunate result was that the evaluation effort foundered. In the absence of any budgetary provision for evaluation, we had intended that the assistants interview participants and obtain at least some simple feedback. One instructor provided a questionnaire instead, only one of which was returned; none of the assistants conducted the interviews.

If the group's supervision had been centralized, and the assistants given some training in the tasks we asked them to perform apart from their recruiting, the results would probably have been considerably improved. Later recommendations for future program development will specify this point.

The Clientele

As we had expected, the participants in the seminars were almost entirely women, mostly unskilled, with educations somewhere below the level of high school graduation. Such a composite picture, however, fails to convey the very considerable diversity found even within a single group. The consumer problems groups were perhaps the most homogeneous, composed of women most of whom were on welfare, but even in this area, one of the seminars was fairly evenly split between welfare clients and others on a higher economic level. This contributed substantially to the instability of that particular group, since the subgroups were interested in somewhat different problems.

The second section of the Negro Problems seminar attracted a minority of men with relative consistency, as did the one on Child Development, after it had been going for a time. It is as though some men became involved out of a curiosity about what their wives were getting so interested in. An occasional man showed up in one of the school seminars and even, more rarely, in one of the consumer problems groups.

The most important characteristic of the clientele, perhaps, was its instability. All non-credit discussion groups, of course, exhibit this trait, and everything we know about lower-class life styles would lead us to expect it in an exaggerated form here. Indeed, it is a matter for some surprise that most of these groups were able to maintain some consistency of attendance. As a practical matter, nevertheless, one must take into account, in any assessment of our results, that people came, then disappeared, that new faces appeared at various intervals, and that only a relatively small solid core benefited from extended, repeated encounter with a set of issues.

Curriculum

The original proposal had suggested a number of possible courses for the program, among them one on human development, consumer problems, and public issues, the latter to be a general current events seminar concentrating on such issues as how to get the facts and how to discern bias. After discussing these early ideas with a number of professionals familiar with the community, we added Negro History to the list, and narrowed the public issues idea to a consideration of educational problems, which is one of the burning issues in the New York ghetto.

The major emphasis in all of the seminars was a reliance for specific curriculum focus on the expressed interests of the members. This flexibility was expressed in a variety of ways, and the report below of the curriculum of each seminar begins with a contrast between the two extremes, one in which the subject matter was most controlled by the instructor, the other in which it was least controlled.

Child Development

Although Mrs. Adair had a definite structure for the series of discussions, special problems were picked up from the group from time to time and sessions planned around them. Some of these emerged from the first evening's discussion, which focussed on an interview with one of the mothers conducted by the instructor. One general concern appeared to be the question of how one introduces children to sex, and a session about it was planned for the future.

In general, the following issues were given extended treatment:

1. Developmental needs of children
2. Children's problems in school, and how to help your child in school.
3. Sexual development and sex education

The group viewed and discussed a number of films, including Angry Boy, Palmour Street, The Quiet One, and several of the Canadian films on child development. They reviewed elementary textbooks, and spent a couple of sessions themselves doing the kinds of things their younger children are asked to do in school, including an encounter with the Initial Teaching Alphabet, the new math and word-building games, and other similar activities.

The best way to characterize this group, perhaps, is to say that it transferred the workshop techniques of some forms of teacher education to a discussion setting with parents, and succeeded very well in making the transfer. The group was enthusiastic, exhibiting a high degree of interest and involvement.

Education and the School

In contrast, the people in Dr. Woock's first section took the bit in their teeth and ran off in their own directions. He devoted the first session to a lively airing of various grievances about the schools, during which the group was attracted by the proposal of one of its members that they get a federal grant to pay Harlem youngsters to attend a remedial summer school. Woock promised to bring to the next meeting a staff member of the OEO to discuss the possibilities of such a project, which he did.

There was great pressure on the instructor from this point to help the group develop a proposal for a suggested program of remedial summer work. He agreed, because it was clear that they wanted action, and were not interested in discussion of more general problems, and because he thought that in the process of trying to get the grant they "would learn a good deal about the structure of educational and poverty bureaucracies in a variety of agencies..." and "the difficulty of conceptualizing, designing, and preparing a sound proposal for a worthwhile educational program."

At the next meeting, in the middle of the discussion, a representative of the Harlem Parents Committee appeared (having been invited by one of our participants), and subjected Dr. Woock to insistent questioning about what New York University in general and Dr. Woock in particular were trying to do in Harlem. He ended by accepting the existence of the group, and their action aim, at least, and suggested they use the community center attached to the church as the requesting agency for the grant. Dr. Woock soon put together a brief memorandum which might be expanded into a proposal, and a few sessions later the group met with a man representing the local block association, and another representing Haryou-Act. Both of these men had withering criticisms to make of the idea of a discussion group, but both ended by agreeing to file the proposal with others they were currently submitting for federal funding.

The two final meetings were practically mass affairs attended by about 20 persons, involving all three groups--our discussion group, the block association, and the District Board of Haryou-Act. The first of these meetings, according to our instructor, was "acrimonious, loud, and almost uncontrollable. The block association people apparently felt that the seminar group was threatening their community position, though they were assured that the group would not be in existence beyond another two weeks. A decision about the adoption of the remedial program proposed by the group was postponed for another meeting. At that final meeting, the Association finally did decide to incorporate it into their summer 1967 program request.

The second section of this seminar was composed of a group of women working in an elementary school as aides, school volunteers, or Head Start parent aides. They were particularly interested in discussing the role of the para-professional in the school, and the first three or four sessions were devoted to aspects of that problem. They went on to consider the relation between poverty and school performance, then to the government's war on poverty.

Although discussion was lively, and these women appeared to enjoy and get a good deal out of the seminar, an assessment of what kind of educational programs they would like in the future revealed a preference for skill-building courses (reading, writing, public speaking), and courses for credit, either on the high school or college level.

Dr. Brown's group came closer to our expectation of what this particular seminar would do. Participants were parents of children in an elementary school in central Harlem, and many of the discussions focused on events or programs in that school. At one meeting the group would consider, for example, a report of a school incident they were indignant about; the instructor would insist that before the next meeting they make every effort to get the real facts about it. The group found itself having to revise its conclusions about a number of incidents, as well as about a number of school problems.

Thus, at one point the group attended a larger meeting held at the school at which a number of community activists argued that the community itself should make the important decisions about the school. In a later discussion of these views, Dr. Brown proposed that the group assume that it <u>had</u> control of this school; what would they do with it, he asked? The discussion that followed was sobering and illuminating.

<u>Negro History</u>

Though this seminar began, traditionally enough, with a film on the role of the Negro in American life, it soon branched out into art, genetics, African anthropology, and even opera. In part this variety resulted from the expressed interests of the group members, and in part from the many enthusiasms of Mr. Ridley. The following topics were discussed at one or more sessions:

Emancipation Proclamation
Nature of prejudice and how it is learned
The rise of African civilization
Development of language and culture in general
Slavery in the United States, the West Indies and South America
The Negro as an American
Race and genetics
Negro contributions to American culture
Black power
Underprivileged family relationships
The war in Vietnam and the role of the Negro in it
The Negro in school textbooks
Sex and race
Technological development of man

Mr. Ridley used films copiously, from a film about the bushmen of Africa to "The Living Machine," and the group also visited the Museum of Natural History at relevant points.

Consumer Problems

In general, the issues discussed in both sets of seminars in this area were much the same, though in both cases the instructors leaned heavily on the interests and questions of the participants. Main emphases were:

Food buying
Buying on credit
Selecting clothes and white goods
Advertising abuses
Business frauds
Small stores vs. department stores
Name brands

Dr. Toyer's first section got off on an interesting tack by discussing the question of the lack of communication within the neighborhood about ways in which people could help one another to save money. They decided to use the bulletin board at the center for notices about things that people had to sell or give away, or wished to exchange. They also began a project in cooperation with the Department of Markets to do a check on neighborhood scales and prices.

Mrs. Seitzman's groups spent some time on budgeting, and on purchasing drugs, which turned out to be particularly valuable for the participants.

Conclusions

This pilot program clearly demonstrates the feasibility of a university non-credit extension into urban under-privileged areas. The question that it does not so clearly answer is: should the university attempt to build a permanent program of this kind? Implicit in that question are really two separate issues, the first having to do with whether such programs, involving people who have not even finished high school, are the proper business of the university; the second, whether the payoff is sufficiently large to justify the subsidy necessary to carry it on.

The role of a university in programs of this kind can be challenged, but surely not on the grounds that participants lack formal preparation. Such an objection reasonably applies at least to ordinary credit programs leading to a degree, but has little relevance to informal programs, where universities have traditionally refrained from applying these admission criteria.

The more relevant issue has to do with the level at which the subject matter is approached. Very few would question the appropriateness of university-sponsored conferences for the improvement of supervision and management in industry and government, though the formal preparation of participants is seldom investigated. Such programs bring to bear on the problems of institutions an important body of research and theory in the behavioral and social sciences, whose development and dissemination is a recognized and central function of the university. Thus, ordinarily it is the level at which the problems are analyzed and discussed that make a program appropriate, not the status of the participants.

With one exception, the Harlem Seminars brought to bear on the problems of the participants data and theoretical formulations relevant to those problems from psychology, anthropology, sociology and other fields--in a simplified form, to be sure, and non-systematically, but the same might be said of many extension programs conducted by graduate schools of business and public administration. Indeed, there are large numbers of courses given for credit by undergraduate institutions which are at a lower intellectual level than our discussion groups--"Physical Education in the Elementary School," to mention only one.

The possible exception are the consumer problems groups. It is difficult to argue that these could not just as well have been conducted by any number of community agencies such as settlement houses or Y's, or that an advanced degree in economics would give one instructor significant superiority over another in conducting the discussions.

But, if the issue of university-appropriateness can be relatively easily dispatched, the remaining question, whether the payoff justifies the effort, cannot. If a consideration of results is restricted to measurable learning and growth for the participants, the very considerable inconsistency of attendance and instability that characterized the groups suggest that nothing very startling happened.

From another point of view, individual growth is not the most significant variable to consider, however. Every major development during the past year in the urban ghetto indicates a worsening of the relationship between the mainstream culture and the underprivileged minorities, especially the Negro. Ordinarily sober and cautious observers are beginning to talk about the possibility of an explosion that may pull apart the painfully woven fabric of a stable social order, nor can anyone in possession of the facts deny that possibility.

The extension of an urban university into the heart of the minority ghetto is unlikely to overcome generations of educational disadvantage, nor will it do very much to attack poverty or materially affect self-defeating life styles endemic in the ghetto. But it can stand as a symbol of "downtown" concern, as a connecting link between the dominant culture and the excluded underclass, in a period when most meaningful lines of communication are rapidly disappearing. That the university should assume such a symbolic role is particularly important, because not only does it have enormous prestige in the society at large, but it is less subject than official institutions to an historically-based suspicion and hostility from the underclass culture.

Some Guidelines

Any program built upon the experiences of this pilot project must obviously not only be heavily subsidized, but should also be on a fairly large scale, if it is to have the visibility necessary to its proposed symbolic role. Our experience suggests the following format:

1. A curriculum embodying a series of eight-ten session seminars around these topics:

   The Child and Family
   Education and the School
   Negro History and the Civil Rights Movement
   Community Action, Leadership, and Tactics
   New York Politics and Government

Participants should be encouraged to enroll in the entire series, and those who complete it should be awarded a certificate of some sort. In this recognition-starved culture such tangible evidence of achievement may be particularly important.

2. The project director should be a Negro, though he should maintain an integrated instructional staff. The principle argued previously in this report against an all-Negro staff does not apply to the selection of a chief administrator, and the advantages are likely to be considerable.

Two full-time professionals should be employed to help the director. One is to take responsibility for recruiting, and will train and supervise a staff of part-time instructional assistants of the sort employed in the pilot program. The second will be an instructional materials expert, who will not only advise instructors about available materials for their courses, and assume responsibility for obtaining them, but also create simple visual aids in cooperation with instructors.

3. Our experience suggests that there would be little difficulty in making arrangements with a number of community centers, churches, and housing projects, for the development of a decentralized network of meeting places for the seminars. The administrative center would consequently require only a minimum of space.

THE LIBRARY OF
DEC 5 - 1967
CONTINUING EDUCATION